

The Principia.

First Principles in Religion, Morals, Government, and the Economy of Life.

VOL. I.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1860.

NO. 14.

The Principia

Published Weekly, at 339 Pearl Street, (two doors above Harper's Buildings) New-York.

WILLIAM GOODELL, Editor.

SAMUEL WILDE, Proprietor.

Taxes: One Dollar a year, in advance.

Direct business letters, with remittances, to

MELANTHON B. WILLIAMS, Publishing Agent,
as above.

PROSPECTUS.

Our object, by this publication, is to promote pure religion, sound morals, Christian reforms; the abolition of slaveholding, caste, the rum-train, and kindred crimes—the application of Christian principles to all the relations, duties, business arrangements, and aims of life—to the individual, the family, the Church, the State, the Nation—to the work of converting the world, to God, restoring the common brotherhood of man, and rendering Society the type of heaven. Our text book is the Bible; our standard, the Divine law; our expediency, obedience; our plan, the Gospel; our trust, the Divine promises; our panoply, the whole armor of God.

—Editors friendly, please copy, or notice.

For The Principia,

LOOK OUT FOR THE ROGUE.

Notwithstanding the good-humored, and as we then thought, finality-treatment of "Mr. PER-SE, alias MALUM-IN-SE," in the September number of the American Missionary, I see the itinerant rogue is still on his circuit, making his bows as briskly as ever, among his old friends, the Editors.

From the Oberlin Evangelist he bows himself into the Tract Journal at Boston, and thence with all the dignity of Editorial introduction and supercilious endorsement, into the New York Independent.

Now, four things are to be remembered, in regard to the history and antecedents of the aforesaid itinerant, just started again under new auspices, in his travels among the churches:

1. The earliest appearance of this gentleman in connection with the subject of Slavery was, we believe, in the year 1833, when Dr. Bacon trotted him out before the world, after his famous definition of Slavery, as "that artificial relation or civil institution, by which one man is invested with a property in the labor of another."

2. The next formal exhibition of this gentleman to the Christian world was in 1845, on the platform of the American Board, when the reason given for not legislating Slavery out of the Cherokee and Choctaw churches, was, that it was not *malum-in-se*, and the declaration was adopted, "That they cannot think that, in all cases, Slavery involves individual guilt in such a manner, that every person implicated in it can, on Scripture grounds, be excluded from Christian fellowship."

3. The next thing to be noted is, that the great Southern apostacy in regard to Slavery, dated from the first formal affirmation at the North, that Slavery is not *malum-in-se*, in the year 1833, and its re-affirmation after debate before the American Board in 1845. The natural reasoning of Southerners at once was, if it is not *malum-in-se*, it must be *bonum-in-se*. And from that time they have been defending and advocating Slavery on the ground of its inherent rightfulness, taught as they were, by Northern divines, that there was in it no inherent wrongfulness.

4. The last thing to be remembered in regard to this Latin itinerant is, that it is not abolitionists that have ever sought or shunned a quarrel with this gentleman, in the prosecution of their Anti-slavery warfare. But he has been invariably invoked as an ally, by the opposing pro-slavery party, whenever honest abolitionists have asserted the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding. They, Christian abolitionists, are not in the habit of hiding themselves in Latin masks; but this has been the panoply of their opponents ever since 1833. It is a principle of our ethics, they say, that Slavery is not *malum-per-se*.

Now it has been well asked, "how many persons are there

in the churches, that know what this phrase, *malum-per-se*, means?" Yet ministers are continually ringing its changes in their ears, till they think it is some profound, indisputable argument. Let the churches no more believe that slaveholding is not in itself sinful, than they believe that *murder* is not in itself sinful. They are as well prepared and as willing to say that slaveholding is inherently sinful, as they are to say that *murder* is inherently sinful. If a man should say that men sometimes kill one another by accident, and therefore that *murder* is not, under all circumstances, sinful in itself, and must not be called *sinful*, the churches would shout at such nonsense. If a man should say that the killing of another by accident is *murder*, and should contend that all killing, under all circumstances, is *murder*, and therefore that *murder* ought never to be said to be *sinful* in itself, you would regard him as a dishonest rascaler, if not as a rogue, who wishes to contrive an apology for the murderers.

"Now the word *murder* might just as properly be applied to killing in self-defence, or to the killing of a murderer in protection of your wife and children from his brutal assault, or to the execution of a murderer by the sheriff, as the word *slaveholding* to the keeping of a man, a brother, under slave law, for the purpose of giving him his freedom. That is not slaveholding, any more than the killing of a murderer, to keep your wife and children from being killed, is *murder*. Yet *murder* is, under all possible circumstances, a crime, and so is slaveholding under all possible circumstances a crime; because *murder* is the intentional killing of a man with malice against him, and slaveholding is the intentional holding of a man as property, against his own will, and without his contract or consent. Slaveholding is the intentional killing of his personal freedom, and the transmutation of him from a person into a thing. And this is always, under all circumstances, in itself, a crime."

H. T. C.

Remarks by the Editor.

Our correspondent H. T. C., has, we think, given a correct account of the history of *Mr. Malum in se*. And it is most indisputably true, that the change that has come over the South, beginning with the clergy, and going from them to the politicians—the change from an apology for the present existence of slavery, conceding it to be a moral evil, to an open defence of slavery, by the Bible, and by the laws of nature, declaring it to be, not an evil, either moral or physical, but innocent, and a blessing—is a change that has taken place in consequence of the clerical defences of slavery at the North, in opposing the Abolitionists, beginning with the denial that slavery is "*sip per se*," or "*malum in se*," and proceeding constantly, in some cases, to a direct defence of slavery by the Bible, as in the pamphlet of Dr. Hodge of Princeton.

Earliest perhaps, in the series, was the definition of Rev. Leonard Bacon, in 1833, as stated by our correspondent. Then came the correspondence between Pres. Wilbur Fisk, of Middletown, Ct., and Prof. Stuart, of Andover, Mass., making the New Testament a pro-slavery book, and Paul's letter to Philemon a warrant for Christian slave catching. It was not until after these lessons, or a portion of them, that Gov. M'Duffie, of S. Carolina, took the position, that slavery is the corner-stone of our Republican edifice, predicting that, within a quarter of a century, the laboring population at the North, "bleached, or unbleached," would be made slaves. This, at the time, appeared startling, and was not, at first, received generally, even at the South. About the same time, the open defence of slavery, on Bible grounds, by Prof. Hodge, of Princeton, N. J., made its appearance in the Biblical Repository, and was struck off in a separate pamphlet, and gratuitously distributed among the clergy of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, at the

session of that body. This we think, was in 1835, or 6. Of its effects among the Southern Clergy, we have heard several authentic statements, one of which, we will relate, as a specimen.

During our residence in Utica, we attended religious worship in the Second Presbyterian Church, of which Rev. Amos Savage was Pastor, a gentleman who was afterwards an agent of the American Tract Society, in Connecticut, and is now deceased. We have frequently heard from him this statement, which was published in some of the papers not long afterward. A Presbyterian Clergyman from the South was travelling in the North, and was detained by sickness, at a hotel in Utica. He inquired for some Presbyterian Clergyman. Mr. Savage was named to him, and at his request, was sent for. An acquaintance between them took place. Among other things, the subject of slavery came up for conversation, when the Southern Clergyman said to him, "We, of the South, never thought of such a thing as defending slavery as innocent, or as sanctioned by the Bible, until we heard it from Northern clergymen," mentioning particularly the pamphlet of Prof. Hodge. "Now," continued he, "I regret to say, that a great change is taking place among us, on the subject."

Many at the North have disengaged from the pamphlet of Prof. Hodge, who failed to see that the whole was embodied in the proposition that slavery is not *malum in se*, (ie.) is not inherently sinful. Nevertheless, the great body of reflecting people do see it, and understand that the clergy who deny the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding, are the defenders of slavery. Especially do intelligent and educated jurist and statesmen see it. John Quincy Adams saw it, and not unfrequently expressed his disgust at it. On this point, we have an incident to relate.

An annual report of the N. Y. State Anti-slavery society adopted at an annual meeting in Utica, was published, in which these clerical defences of slavery, were noticed, particularly some of these positions of Rev. Leonard Bacon of New Haven, and also the action of the General Assembly of Congregational Ministers, in that State, in resolving to exclude Anti-slavery lecturers from their pulpits, and if possible, from their parishes, all of which was defended by Mr. Bacon, who, in a letter to Gerrit Smith, the President of the N. Y. State A. S. Society, complained that he had given his sanction to a report in which the Congregational ministers of Connecticut, were represented as pro-slavery. This letter appeared in the Religious Intelligencer, of New Haven, and drew out a reply from the writer of the Annual Report, sustaining the correctness of the charge. This appeared in the Utica Friend of Man, the N. Y. Emancipator, and the New Haven Religious Intelligencer, and extra copies of it were distributed throughout New England, one of which fell into the hands of John Quincy Adams. The writer of the Annual Report, and of the reply to Mr. Bacon, having soon after attended an Anti-slavery Convention in Boston, improved the opportunity of calling on John Quincy Adams, at his residence in Quincy. As soon as he announced his name, Mr. Adams took him by the hand, saying, with a smile, "Then you are the gentleman that has been using up Rev. Leonard Bacon of New Haven!" He proceeded to review, rapidly and tersely, the whole subject of that discussion, evincing his perfect familiarity with it, and closed by exclaiming, "What perfect nonsense is it for those Connecticut ministers to think of throwing off the odium of being pro-slavery!" This, he said with an emphasis, and an expression of countenance which the writer vividly remembers to this day.

And it is "perfect nonsense." That men of education who understand the force of language, and are scrupulously exact and precise in their use of it, should perseveringly contend, for more than a quarter of a century, that slave-

holding is not "malum in se," is not "sin per se," is not in itself sinful, and then complain that they are abused, by being called pro-slavery, defenders of the innocence and righteousness of the practice and of the system by which those who persevere in it have entrenched themselves, is among the strongest instances of moral blindness and infatuation, on record.

We had supposed that the day of such folly was passing away, until we attended the Convention at Worcester, when the Church Anti-slavery Society was formed, and heard from the lips of the clerical opposers of its platform, the confident declaration, that not more than a dozen Orthodox Congregational ministers, could be found, in all New England, who could be persuaded to join a society on a basis of the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding. If this be true, so much the worse for such ministers! The record of their pro-slaveryism, must go down to posterity, and be the astonishment of coming ages. *There is no help for it!* And no clamor about "infidel abolition," (an infidelity caused by the preposterous position of such ministers), can avert or modify the verdict of universal future Christendom against them. Even now, the approximation toward it, out of certain charmed circles, and in this country, is nearer than they are aware of. Throughout the Churches, the most pious portion of the membership, is against them. And the money loving and office seeking portions of their Congregations, to whom they are so obsequious, secretly despise them. There is not a statesman of any breadth of calibre, Democrat, American, or Republican, who, if he would speak out his real sentiments in respect to them, would differ essentially from John Quincy Adams.

The case is an exceedingly simple one. If slaveholding be not inherently sinful, then it is inherently innocent and righteous. There can be no conceivable middle ground between the two. If it be inherently innocent and righteous, then its legal protection by civil government, becomes a duty, and a prohibition of the innocent and righteous practice becomes a usurpation.

Still farther, if the so called "legal relation" of master and slave, which is the relation of an owner to his property—be not inherently sinful, but inherently innocent and righteous, then the duty of a legal protection of that property, as property, stands on the same moral ground, as the duty of legal protection to property, in horses and oxen. Such protection is the object and essence of the American Slave Code, all the provisions of which, as experience and slaveholding statesmen and jurists assure us, are necessary, for the protection of that property. So that a denial of the inherent sinfulness of slaveholding involves a denial of the inherent sinfulness of the slave code, and, on the other hand, amounts to a declaration of the duty of a legal protection of slave property, by the State and National governments. The Dred Scott decision of Judge Taney, the demand of Virginia for the legal protection of slave property in New York, and the rising clamor for a repeal of the laws against the African slave trade, are the legitimate and necessary outgrowths of the heresy that slaveholding is not inherently sinful!

Henry Ward Beecher On the Plymouth Church discussion.

HIS POSITION DEFINED AND VINDICATED.

From the N. Y. Independent.

PLYMOUTH CHURCH DISCUSSION.

From the formation of Plymouth church until the beginning of the year 1857—a period of ten years—the Plymouth church of Brooklyn was accustomed to make an annual collection for Foreign Missions, and to pay the same into the treasury of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions. There had never been any known or expressed wish to the contrary.

But, as early as 1855-6, the pastor, at the request of the Treasurer of the American Missionary Association, requested all in the congregation who wished their missionary contributions to go to this last-named Society, to signify their wish, and they should be so applied; while the rest of the collection would go as always before, to the American Board.

At the annual church meeting, Dec. 17, 1856, the following action took place.

"On motion of Brother Tappan, it was unanimously voted that the money collected for Home Missions in the month of March, not specially designated shall be equally

divided between the American Home, and the American Missionary Association, Home Department, and the money collected in the month of October for Foreign Missions, and not specially designated shall be equally divided between the Foreign Missionary Society and the American Missionary Association, Foreign Department."

This change was made without consultation with the pastor, and without his knowledge, he being absent from the annual business church meeting. Nor was he informed of it until the next Missionary collection was taken up.

To this arrangement we objected, as tending to great confusion, and as calculated to diminish the missionary collections, already too small. We proposed putting each Society on its own ground—giving a collection to the Home Missionary Society for itself, to the American Board a collection by itself, and to the American Missionary Association a separate collection for its field. And, for the past year, this has been the substantial operation of things.

In the annual meeting of the church for 1859, a movement was made to exclude the American Board entirely, and to give the whole missionary collection a more specifically anti-slavery direction. And this was the question that was really at issue. The pastor advocated a separate contribution for each of the three missionary societies, viz., for the American Board, the Home Missionary Society and the American Missionary Association. And this, in the end, was the decision of the church; and by an overwhelming majority.

And now, what was the point of disagreement? Simply this. A portion of the brethren of the church regarded the American Board as having, through their missions to the American Indians such relations to slavery as made it wrong for the church to countenance them.

The ground taken by the pastor was substantially this.

1. That the holding of the slaves, in the spirit of the system of American slavery, and for the intents and purposes of that system, is sinful, and inconsistent with the Christian character; rendering the slaveholder unfit for church-membership, and a proper subject for church discipline if he be already within the church. And the presumption, in every case, is that a slaveholder is a sinner against God and man, by the act of holding men deprived of their liberty and depravation of their rights; that the sinfulness of slavery does not consist in the abuse of the system, but in the very operation of it according to its own nature and written laws, as established in the blackest record of Time,—the American Slave-Code of Laws.

2. But if, in any single case, a man can prove that, though he holds the legal relation of slaveholder, it is against his wish and without his moral consent; that he is doing all that the laws or the peculiar circumstances of trust in which he is placed will allow, to give his slaves their rights; and that he is preparing them for liberty and training them as if free, except the mere name and compulsory relation of master—then we hold that this man, in so far as slaveholding is concerned, is worthy of confidence, trust, and religious fellowship.

We affirm, then, that a slaveholder is either not a Christian, or else is living in a sin that makes him a proper subject of moral and church discipline. Every church should act upon the presumption (just as courts act upon the presumption that taking human life is murder, unless it be specially shown to be justifiable homicide) that a slaveholder is unworthy of church-fellowship. And a clear and satisfactory exception must be made to this rule in every case where a slaveholder is allowed church-privileges; and he must make it appear that he holds slaves no longer by his own wish, nor for profit, nor in the spirit of the detestable and accursed slave laws of the American slave states; but that, desiring to free his slaves, he is hindered and prevented, and that, being willing but unable to free them, he conducts himself toward them as if they were free, regarding their rights and interests, and not his own.

3. In discussing the moral nature of slaveholding, we object to the terms *malum in se*, or *bonum in se*. We object, both for philosophical and upon practical reasons, to all arguments upon the nature of moral acts *per se*. Without entering into the merits of this objection, it is sufficient to say, that it is better for good men to unite and make war upon slavery as it is, both by its abhorred system of laws, its actual practice, and its unquestionable fruits. There is the gigantic Evil, looming up like some terrific storm, black

over half the heavens, and emitting fire flashes that wite and blast whatever they touch!

All who are of one mind on this subject, should unite and co-operate to bring every moral and equitable secular influence to bear against this modern Sodom and Gomorrah. Instead of that, the North is divided up into schools and sections, by the force of philosophical niceties. The anti-slavery host are not cordially and enthusiastically co-operative. There is a *doctrinal* spirit among them, as high, as exclusive, and as foolish as ever there was in the religious world. There is a disposition to punish men for not holding the high anti-slavery creed, up to the very letter of its philosophical doctrines. And as we have always contended against this fanaticism of doctrine in religious matters, so we consistently abhor the bigotry of it, in great questions of philanthropy. We are more than willing that men should ground their own conduct on their own philosophical reasons; but, we hold that all men who are willing, practically and earnestly, to give their influence against slavery, should be united, and that no man should be punished, crippled, or reproached for his honest belief on this subject, any more than for his religious beliefs. We are lovers of freedom in political relations, in moral philosophical matters, and to the very core of life.

Nothing, therefore, can be further from the truth than the statement of *The N. Y. Tribune*:

"Mr. Beecher made some very extraordinary declaration in his speech on Monday evening. For example: he then declared that nothing was good or bad in itself, and that slavery was not a universal wrong. Without embarking upon any metaphysical disquisition, we may at least ask if African slavery as we know it in the United States and elsewhere, is not a wrong, an infernal wrong, and an accursed nuisance as well? And as this is the practical point in the whole discussion, Mr. Beecher's declaration, which is of very questionable character in connection with it, and which bears against the great truth itself, seems to us a savor of unusual eccentricity."

How far this is from a correct representation, will appear from the tenor of this article.

4. In regard to the American Board, we did not attempt a minute account of all the steps by which it had reached its present position. But, through years of gradually increasing explicitness, the Board has at last reached a ground of the most positive and substantive anti-slavery truth.

If the American Board administer their trust in the spirit and according to the doctrines laid down in their latest encyclical, contained in a paper called the *Good Water Agreement*, there can be little doubt that the Board and their missionaries will bring the Gospel to bear upon the subject of slavery in the most thorough and cleansing manner.—We give a few points of this Good Water platform:

"1. Slavery, as a system, and, in its own proper nature, is what it is described to be, in the General Assembly's Act of 1818, and the Report of the American Board adopted at Brooklyn in 1845.

"2. Deprivation of liberty by holding slaves is, therefore, not to be ranked with things indifferent, but with those which, if not made right by special jusificatory circumstances and the intention of the doer, are morally wrong.

"3. Those are to be admitted to the communion of the church, of whom the missionary and (in Presbyterian churches) his session have satisfactory evidence that they are in fellowship with Christ.

"4. The evidence, in one view of it, of fellowship with Christ, is a manifested desire and aim to be conformed, in all things, to the spirit and requirements of the word of God.

"5. Such desire and aim are to be looked for in reference to slavery, slaveholding, and dealing with slaves, as in regard to other matters; not less, not more."

The force of the first paragraph cannot be appreciated, unless our readers are familiar with the *doctrine* of this famous act of the Presbyterian Church of 1818. We give therefore, a portion of it:

"The General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, having taken into consideration the subject of slavery, think proper to make known their sentiments upon it to the churches and people under their care. We consider the voluntary enslaving of one part of the human race by another, as a gross violation of the most precious and sacred rights of human nature; as utterly inconsistent with the law of God, which requires as to love our neighbor as ourselves, and as totally irreconcileable with the spirit and principles of the Gospel of Christ, which enjoins that 'all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them.' Slavery creates a paradox in the moral system; it exhibits rational, accountable, and immortal beings in such circumstances as scarcely to leave them the power of moral action. It exhibits them as dependent

on the will of construction; whether the dearmen neighbors chasitity and humanity. consequent with its various worst degree place, as influence of mind of man to the dan may inflict inhumanity.

If the A for the prments ind greet this g with distre courageme

Great pa that we ha mer anti-slavery changes to abhorred a ligant in and religio determined imitatem wa

But, for knowledge attemp to ry doctrin

"If Slave The above old of 30th before the case," at A Mr. O'Cono and having still strange of human man, proce case, Slave This, we u the Herald above.

This rem another occ

Abolition quiry—" If Sometimes O'Conor an is not mali that the p

able and fa not the pos of the inju

We comm to the care

I submit ified, here to draw the American whole conf addressed to very able a myself in t more. My monstrous and of the in the cour your atten to the rem consigned slavery. V tion of the microscope, ent this que he called a Why, if you estimate the laws and in every one a stitution, a

on the will of others, whether they shall receive religious instruction; whether they shall know and worship the true God; whether they shall enjoy the ordinances of the Gospel; whether they shall perform the duties and cherish the endearments of husbands and wives, parents and children, neighbors and friends, whether they shall preserve their chastity and purity, or regard the dictates of justice and humanity. Such are some of the consequences of slavery—consequences not imaginary, but which connect themselves with its very existence. The evils to which the slave is always exposed often take place in fact, and in the very worst degree and form; and where all of them do not take place, as we rejoice to say in many instances, through the influence of the principles of humanity and religion on the mind of masters, they do not,—still the slave is deprived of his natural right, degraded as a human being, and exposed to the danger of passing into the hands of a master who may inflict upon him all the hardships and injuries which inhumanity and avarice may suggest."

If the American Board holds its missionaries responsible for the preaching of a Gospel as anti-slavery as these documents indicate, is it wise for churches now, at length, to greet this growth and fruit of long discussion and influence with distrust and rejection? Is this the reward and encouragement of those who come to the light?

Great pains have been taken to spread abroad the rumor, that we have changed our ground, and receded from former anti-slavery opinions. It is needless to say, that we have given up nothing, changed nothing, except as a bud changes to a blossom, and a blossom to a fruit. We never abhorred slavery so much. We never more dreaded its malignant influence both upon white and black, upon civil and religious institutions. We never were more invincibly determined to make no terms with it, but to carry on legitimate war, to the end and destruction of it.

But, for that very sake, we shall refuse a zeal without knowledge, and all bigotry of anti-slavery feeling, and all attempts to punish men for variation of belief on anti-slavery doctrine.

◆◆◆◆◆

"If Slavery be a Sin, How Shall the North be Justified?"

The above caption, strangely enough, stands in the *N. Y. Herald* of 30th January, over "Mr. O'Conor's argument in reply," before the Court of Appeals, on the trial of the "Lemmon Slave case," at Albaay.

Mr. O'Conor having affirmed that Negro Slavery is not unjust, and having endeavored to fortify that strange position, with the still stranger denial that Negro Slavery involves the principle of human chattelhood and the claim of absolute property in man, proceeds to argue that it cannot be so, because, in that case, Slavery, being proved a sin, the North cannot be justified! This, we understand, to be the drift of the argument. That the *Herald* thus understands him, is evident from its caption as above.

This reminds us of the argument, or remonstrance urged on another occasion—"Master, Thus saying, thou reproachest us also."

Abolitionists have often been censured for suggesting the inquiry—"If Slavery be a sin, how shall the North be justified?" Sometimes the question has been answered, in substance, as Mr. O'Conor answered it, by saying that slaveholding is not unjust, *in se*. Sometimes, it has been answered by denying that the people of the North are, in any way, responsible for Slavery. And Abolitionists have been stigmatized as uncharitable and fanatical, for thinking and saying so. This latter, is not the position of Mr. O'Conor and the *Herald*. The doctrine of the injustice of Slavery, they regard as criminating the North.

We commend the following extract from Mr. O'Conor's Speech, to the careful attention of our readers:

I submit, most respectfully, that the only desire I have manifested, here or elsewhere, in reference to this question, has been to draw the mind of the Court, and the intelligent mind of the American people, to the true question which underlies this whole conflict, and that is the question to which my friend has addressed the best, and, in my judgment, the finest part of his very able argument. It is the point to which I mainly addressed myself in the opening, and on it I will now say a very few words more. My friend denounces this institution of Slavery as a monstrous injustice, as a sin, as a violation of the law of God and of the law of man, of natural law or natural justice; and in the course of his argument, at a different place, he called your attention to the enormity of the result claimed in this case, that these eight persons—and not only they, but their posterity to the remotest time—were, by your honor's judgment, to be consigned to this shocking condition of abject bondage and slavery. Why, how very small and minute was that presentation of the subject! My friend must certainly have used the microscope, or reversed the telescope, when, in seeking to present this question in a striking manner to your Honors' minds, he called attention to these few persons and their posterity. Why, if your Honors please, our territory embraces at the least estimate three millions of these human beings, who, by our laws and institutions, as now existing in these States, and as every one admits, protected in those States by the Federal Constitution, are not only consigned to hopeless bondage through-

out their whole lives, but to a like condition is their numerous posterity consigned to the remotest time. They have, since the Union was formed, multiplied three or four fold, and are constantly increasing and multiplying. It is not eight persons and their posterity, but three millions and their countless posterity that are to be forever passed into or left in this state of subjection to their masters in slavery, henceforth and forever. It is a question of the mightiest magnitude. But the reason why I call your Honor's attention to its magnitude is this: that you may contemplate it in the connection in which my learned friend has presented it: that is, as a sin—as a violation of natural justice and the law of God—that it is a monstrous scheme of iniquity for defrauding the laborer of his wages, one of those sins that crieth aloud daily to heaven for vengeance—that it is a course of unbridled rapine, fraud and plunder, by which these millions and their posterity are to be oppressed throughout all time. Now, is it a sin? Is this outrage against divine law and natural justice? If it be such an outrage, then, I say it is a sin of the greatest magnitude—of the most enormous and flagitious character that was ever presented to the human mind. The man who does not shrink back from it with horror is utterly unworthy of the name of man. It is no trivial offence, that may be tolerated with limitations and qualifications, that we can excuse ourselves for supporting because we have made some kind of a bargain to support it. The tongue of no human being is capable of depicting its enormity; it is not in the power of the human heart to form a just conception of its wickedness and cruelty. And what, I ask, is the rational and necessary consequence, if we regard it to be thus sinful, thus unjust, thus outrageous? Look at this question as American citizens, as members of this great republic—consider it as patriots. I ask you what ought to be the effect if this system of slavery is sinful and unjust? Why, its existence under our system of law, supported by our jurisprudence, sustained by the fundamental law of the land, is a public and crying reproach against the whole nation. Ought a just, enlightened, honest Frenchman or Englishman to meet, shake hands with, or entertain at his table one of these Southern slaveholders? Certainly not. There would be no more propriety in his doing it than in one of our fair countrywomen, of pure life and morals, associating in public with one who was the most unworthy of her sex. There would be no more propriety in it than in one of your honors, associating with a highwayman or pickpocket, merely because in the village of his residence there was a bad police or no law to bring him to justice. I say we arraign our Southern brethren at the bar of human society, as totally unfit to associate with any honest European gentleman. And I should like to know what we have to say about our own pious selves, here at the North. Our Southern neighbors have been brought up with this institution in their midst, having been taught that it was just and proper, they indeed might have the excuse of "invincible ignorance," and they might be tolerated as not wicked, but only benighted and in error. But what think you of the inhabitants of the free States, who know it is wicked, who say it is wicked, who write upon their statute books, in their supreme sovereign capacity, that it is wicked, and who yet live under a Constitution^a and a compact by which they agree to support and sustain it to the full extent of whatever is written in that compact, and who, if any one of these unhappy victims should escape from the slavery to which he is consigned, and fly hither for shelter, would seize and return him, or at least would permit his master to come here, seize him and carry him back into bondage? Why, we have no excuse. We know it is wicked and pernicious, if it be so; and yet we sit down and live under a system of law which compels its support to this extent; and whenever one of us is elected to public office, he puts his hand upon the sacred book and pledges himself to be in all things faithful to that law and to support that constitution. Why, I say, a free and enlightened European might excuse a benighted Southerner; but if he has a sense of honor, if he has a sense of justice, if he has due self-respect, he will turn his back on the wilfully offending Northern man, as the vilest of the vile. The patriot must contemplate his country as a whole, as a unit, and himself as honored in being enrolled among its citizens. Can he be a patriotic American who joins in the cry of Exeter Hall against his country's Constitution, who joins with the foreign adversary in denouncing it as a foul reproach to the name of humanity, as an outrage against common decency, a thing which exists in defiance of natural justice and the law of God? Why, I have only to say, imitating the language of Him whose words are recorded in the Sacred Volume—and I suppose, in an humble way, we may strive to imitate whatever we find in his example—I say for our Northern friends who have fallen into this fatal delusion, "Father, forgive them, for they know not what they do." It is all that can be said for them. Certainly, the sentiment of patriotism which made the gallant Decatur declare that he would "stand by his country, right or wrong," must be pretty effectually cast out from the bosom of every American who can join in the outcry of the stranger, the rival and the hater, pronouncing the Constitution of his country a league with iniquity, an instrument which, by its terms and letter, unjustly and cruelly holds three millions of human beings, who are well entitled to liberty, in hopeless and intolerable bondage. I said in my opening, that I did not see how any honest man could understandingly believe that negro slavery is thus wicked and unjust, and yet retain in his bosom the sentiment of fidelity to this Constitution. I now add: I see not how any man can have a lively, a proper, a just, a solid sentiment of patriotism [unless it is that narrow patriotism which confines itself to his native village, and shuts out the great and glorious present and future of our vast country] and join in the outcry against the Constitution of his country, and against the established and existing institutions of so large a portion of it as is formed by those States now holding slaves. Therefore, whether men look to the law of God or to the principles of natural reason and justice, whether they look to the exalted and manly spirit of patriotism that would sacrifice all things except justice and God's will for its country, I see not how any man can entertain that sentiment, and yet join in this most disastrous and destructive crusade against negro slavery. They do it not, understandingly, and this is their only excuse.

Observations are cited by my learned friends, to excuse their views and to support their course, from very illustrious and very distinguished men. Certain remarks of the illustrious Washington, certain remarks of Thomas Jefferson, are quite frequently cited in this connection. No sound minded, rational man believes that if these illustrious men could be recalled to earth and here at this day, living witnesses of the condition of our country, witnesses of its progress and its probable future, they would be willing to repeat, in the sense in which they are understood on the other side, the expressions cited. They would be found, if they were here, on the side of their country, its protection as a whole, its prosperity, its permanency, its glory and its honor. They would not be found denouncing the American name as covered with the undying stigma inwrought with the perpetuation of injustice. They would not be found pronouncing the first sentence in the Constitution—that it was made to "establish justice"—a piece of hypocrisy and falsehood. They would not be found maintaining that the phrases concerning human equality found in the Declaration of Independence, and the Constitution of Virginia were intended to include negroes. No man of common sense but can see that these words were not intended to include negroes. The then existing state of facts, and the practice of those men who used them prove that they were not used in the sense now contended for. That, if your Honors please, is fully elucidated in the Dred Scott decision. We are there told what must be acknowledged—that it was a free white race who established this republic. They made their Declaration of Independence, their Constitution and their laws for themselves. They did not intend to invite hither the Mohammedan, with his dozen wives and his seraglio. They did not intend to invite the idolatrous Chinese, with their temples and their idols. They did not intend to decare that the African negroes were men, citizens or inhabitants, in the political sense of these words. I say the men who held slaves and who sustained the institution could not have so intended. It is impossible to suppose they could. And if my learned friends mean to insinuate that there were in the councils of the nation at that time, some persons of the same conscientious scruples as themselves, who believed Slavery to be wicked and unlawful, and who contrived to get these words into these instruments as a declaration that would ultimately crush out the institution, it is presenting a picture of those men that should be treated as a foul insult by any one who could claim the honor of a descendant from any of them. It is not the place of conscience or of honor to work into a compact an acknowledgment of that which the other party to the contract does not mean to acknowledge. It is unworthy so to do in the smallest, slightest, meanest little contract. Who shall dare impute it to the worthy and honored spirits of the Revolution, who came from that part of the country where the greatest objection to Slavery existed? I apprehend, so far as we find manifested on the part of these gentlemen, opposition to Slavery, they may well have grounded it on a point of expediency, or considerations as to the relative shares of political power which one or the other portion of the country might exercise. But it can never be said, with safety to the honor of these gentlemen, or to the honor of our country, that they believed negro slavery to be, in itself, wicked and unjust. I think they did not believe it, but if they did they were shortsighted as to the future; they did not comprehend that Slavery must last, that the negro race was to increase in this country as it has increased, and that the onward progress, greatness and glory of this country—its march to the high stand it is destined to take—was dependent on the existence of this very system in its warm climates. If they did mean to use words in the Declaration of Independence in a sense different from that in which they were accepted by their associates, it was a departure from the path of honor and rectitude. This alternative I never will adopt. Shame on that man among their descendants who will consent to adopt it!

^a Note.—Admitting the Constitution to be pro-Slavery, Mr. O'Conor's inference is correct.—Editor.

◆◆◆◆◆

The Assault upon Mr. Hickman.

From the Washington Correspondent of the Philadelphia Press, Feb. 11.

Last evening, after the adjournment of the House, the Hon. Henry A. Edmundson, of Virginia, attempted to draw the Hon. John Hickman, of Pennsylvania, into a personal encounter. The matter has been kept very close by all the parties concerned, but I learn that the gentleman from the XIIth Virginia District has been nursing his wrath ever since Mr. Hickman made his famous speech stating that the eighteen millions of the North would not permit the South to dissolve the Union. As the Vice-President, accompanied by the Hon. Messrs. Clingman, Keitt and Edmundson, was passing from the Capitol, through the grounds toward the avenue, Mr. Hickman was perceived ahead of them. Disengaging himself from his associates, Mr. Edmundson went forward, passed Mr. Hickman, turned, and, facing him, gave expression to some heated remarks touching the courage of the North, after making allusion to one of Mr. Hickman's recent serenade speeches in honor of the Anti-Administration triumph. After a few words had passed between the parties, Mr. Edmundson, I learn, attempted to strike Mr. Hickman with a twig he picked up for the purpose, Mr. Hickman strove to clinch with the Virginian when the Vice-President and the others, seeing the "impending crisis," hastened forward. Mr. Clingman, followed by his friends, promptly interfered.

The Principia.

NEW-YORK, SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 18, 1860.

H. W. Beecher's Vindication Reviewed.

In another part of our paper, we insert from the Independent, Mr. Beecher's version of the late discussion in the Plymouth Church, of Brooklyn, concerning the American Board in its relation to slavery; and of the part he took in that discussion.

"Nothing can be farther from the truth," says Mr. Beecher, "than the statements of the *N. Y. Tribune*," which he quotes, and which will be found similar to the passage we quoted in ours, of Feb. 4th, from the *N. Y. Times*, except that the *Tribune's* report which Mr. Beecher repudiates, is less fully and clearly expressed, less sharply defined than the one in the *Times*, so that his repudiation of the former, includes still more signally, the latter.

We are glad to see this disclaimer of Mr. Beecher, which we doubt not, is made honestly, in good faith. It shows that he does not intend to be reckoned among the defenders or apologists of slavery, some of whom have lately dishonored him by their commendations of his course in that debate. He claims rank with the friends of freedom, among whom he has hitherto been reckoned, and where he will, we trust, continue to be reckoned.

At the same time, his position, as now deliberately defined and published by him, becomes a fair subject of examination. And, without impeaching his integrity of purpose, we may be permitted to scrutinize the soundness of his philosophy, and the consistency of his position.

1. In his first proposition, Mr. Beecher affirms the sinfulness of slaveholding *for the intents and purposes of the system*. This implies that slaves may be held for other purposes. Is this correct? Can he be said to hold slaves, who is merely going through the necessary process of liberating them speedily? Of any others, may it be presumed that they are holding slaves, for any other intents and purposes than those of the system? Says Mr. B., "The presumption in every case, is that a slaveholder is a sinner against God, &c." This seems to answer our questions.

2. "But if, in a single case," resumes Mr. B., "a man can prove that though he holds the legal relation of slaveholder, it is without his wish and moral consent," &c., then Mr. B. holds that, "so far as slaveholding is concerned, he is worthy of confidence, trust, and religious fellowship."

"If!" But are there any such cases of slaveholding? Cannot any slaveholder, in defiance of the statute, cease to be a slaveholder? Is there any such thing as "compulsory relation of slave master?" We remember that such pleas were made, twenty years ago. But we think it is now pretty well understood, and generally admitted, that a man may cease to be a slaveholder, who desires it, the statute notwithstanding. As for "preparing (slaves) for liberty," which is mentioned by Mr. B., in this connection, we thought it was now conceded, on all hands, that the very first step toward elevating the slave, must be setting him free. Preparation, education, progress—these are the very things that slavery necessarily forbids. No man can have a right to hold a man in a state of slavery, on the plea of preparing him for freedom, that is, for the protection of law! No such preparation is needed.

But, waiving all these matters, and assuming, for the arguments' sake, that Mr. Beecher's first two propositions are substantially correct, how does it appear that they have been adopted, and faithfully acted upon, by the American Board? We see nothing in the statements of Mr. B., concerning its past or present position, by which anything of the kind is proved.

By the "Good Water platform," the Board approvingly referred to the description of slavery made by the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church, in 1818, and adopted by the American Board, at Brooklyn, in 1845. And a quotation from that description is introduced by Mr. B., in which the sinfulness of the slave system is clearly shown and affirmed.

So far, so good. But is a declaration of the sinfulness of a system or of a practice, all that is needed? Will the declaration answer, instead of putting away the sin? So the

Presbyterian Church seems to suppose. It cherishes the ancient testimony, re-affirms it, and points to the record, in proof that she is guilty of no sin, in practicing the very thing she condemns! The Methodist Episcopal Church does the same. Their anti-slavery creeds are regarded as making ample amends for their pro-slavery practices. Their condemnation of it, transforms it into innocence.

"If" says Mr. B., "the American Board hold its missionaries responsible for the preaching of a gospel as anti-slavery as these documents indicate, is it wise, for churches now, at length, to greet this growth and fruit of long discussion and influence, with distrust and rejection?

"If" But has the Board thus made its missionaries responsible for the preaching of this anti-slavery "gospel"? Have they preached it? Are they now doing so? Is it made a condition of their support, by the Board?

But if they have?—If they do, what then? Is this sufficient, while, as in the Presbyterian and Methodist Episcopal Churches, the *testimony against slavery suffices only to cover over, and shelter and sanctify the continued and persistent practice of slaveholding*, in the Mission Churches?

3. We pass to the third point discussed by Mr. Beecher, that we mean, in which he says:

"In discussing the moral nature of slaveholding, we object to the terms, *malum in se*, or *bonum in se*. We object, both for philosophical and practical reasons, to all arguments upon the nature of moral acts *per se*," &c., &c.,

Now if Mr. B., only objects to the Latin terms employed, and which so few readers understand, we are ready to go with him. Their introduction was not by those who hold our views. But we understand him to mean more than this. We understand him to object to the condemnation of slaveholding, as being, in itself, (or inherently,) sinful. We understand him to object to all arguments upon the nature of moral acts, in themselves, or on their own account. If this be not his meaning, expressed in plain English, instead of Latin, what is it?

And, if this be his meaning, wherein, (we ask for information), does it differ, in sentiment, from the report in the Tribune, (or in the Times,) which he disclaims? We fail to discover the difference. Can it be pointed out? Our objection to his present statement, is precisely the same that we made to his former one. We need not repeat it again. We hold it to be wrong in the abstract and in the concrete, wrong in its philosophy, and consequently, mischievous in its practical bearings.

But Mr. Beecher proceeds to say:

"Without entering into the merits of this objection, it is sufficient to say, that it is better for good men to unite and make war upon slavery as it is, both by its abhorred system of laws, and by its unquestionable fruits, * * All who are of one mind on this subject, should unite and co-operate to bring every moral and equitable secular influence to bear against this modern Sodom and Gomorah. Instead of this, the North is divided up into schools and sections, by the force of philosophical niceties. The anti-slavery host is not cordially and enthusiastically co-operative."

That is to say, the people should unite, and make war upon slavery, "without entering into the merits of the question," whether it be inherently wicked or no! How is this? If it be not inherently wicked, if it be inherently innocent, what right have the people to "make war" upon it? Especially how shall they bring "every moral influence to bear against" it? What "moral" right has Mr. Beecher to pronounce it the "modern Sodom and Gomorah," without entering into the merits of the question, and ascertaining it to be inherently sinful?

"If the trumpet give an uncertain sound, who shall prepare himself for the battle?" If religious teachers do not put a difference between the precious and the vile, between the innocent and the criminal, who shall know what to "make war against," and what "to let alone?" If slaveholding be not inherently sinful, (*malum in se*, *sin per se*, if we must use Latin.) then it is inherently innocent, and, instead of "making war against" it, we were bound to shield it by legal protection, as other innocent interests and relations should be protected. What Mr. Beecher calls its "abhorred system of laws," may perhaps be proved to be only the necessary protection of innocence, and of legitimate rights.

Will it be said that "its actual practice and its unquestionable fruits" sufficiently warrant and require "a war" against it? This is true, but it is true only because "by their fruits shall ye know them"—shall know that the tree producing such fruit, is inherently wicked. "The tree" it-

self, "is known by the fruits, and therefore the tree itself, not its effects merely, should be "hewn down, and cast into the fire," not pruned, nor surrounded merely by a paper girdle, like the Missouri compromise, to prevent its growth and extension. Experience has demonstrated, what philosophy, or rather religion, had all along taught to those who would listen; namely, that the only way to get rid of the fruits, is to destroy the tree that produces them—that its growth is to be stopped, only by destroying its vitality.

Experience, too, has taught that there can be no such thing as uniting good men to "make war against slavery," without "entering into the merits of the question, whether it be inherently sinful!" As a matter of fact, those only are making war with slavery itself, (as distinguished from its mere effects and incidents), except those who believe slavery to be inherently sinful. Those who do not thus believe, or who are content to waive the question, "without entering into its merits" content themselves with a fruitless war with the effects, the consequences, the aggressions on free labor; in one word, the providential punishments inflicted on us, for permitting slavery, all the while pledging themselves to let slavery itself alone, where it already exists; provided it will contrive and consent to work the miracle of living without breathing, without moving, without food to feed upon, without growth and expansion in consequence of breathing, exercising, and feeding. It is in this philosophical enterprise, if we mistake not, that Mr. Beecher is, himself laboring, very zealously and hopefully, we doubt not, but with as much probability of success, as if he were trying the experiment over again, of killing an eel by penning it up in an eel-pot, and drowning it.

Many who love and admire Henry Ward Beecher, have been perplexed and annoyed by some things in his utterances, which may now be explained. In a splendid lecture on slavery, in the Broadway Tabernacle, a few years since, he took pains to have it understood that he spoke only as a citizen, not as a Christian minister. The Church, as such, had nothing to do with the subject. Why should it be otherwise, if we are to ignore the question, whether slavery be inherently sinful? So at Ithaca, in 1856, some of his friends were astonished at his saying, "May my right arm fall from my shoulder blade, if ever I interfere with slavery in the slave States." Political action was the topic, doubtless, but if slavery be inherently sinful, the nation never had a right to establish and to administer a National Government, that should allow its existence. So also, in advocating the use of Sharpe's rifles to defend white freedom in Kansas, but not to defend black liberty in Virginia. Mr. B. must have decided his course "without entering into the merits" of slavery, whether it be in itself, criminal. We must defend Mr. B. from the imputation of having changed his position. Those who think so, have only failed to understand him. Self-consistency in opposing slavery by "moral influence," or in classifying it with "Sodom and Gomorah," we cannot however accord to him. His "philosophy" is at variance with his moral instincts. The latter will preserve him from "apostolizing."

We heartily agree with Mr. Beecher in deprecating the introduction of "philosophical niceties" into the ranks of the friends of freedom, thus dividing them into schools and sects, confounding their tongues, and distracting their counsels! What are those "philosophical niceties?" By whom, and for what ends, have they been introduced? Abolitionists, properly so called; abolitionists not ashamed of the name, are not accountable for them. Abolitionists came before the Church and the Nation, with a simple declaration, which everybody understood, and to which the mass of men at first, Northern and Southern, made no objection. They but echoed the then existing creed of the country, when they said slaveholding is wicked. They simply demanded that this acknowledged wickedness, should be once done away. "Not now" responded worldly prudent. "It would not be safe, It would hazard the Union, it would disturb the peace of the Churches!" "Nay," replies the abolitionists, "it is always safe to cease from sin!"

Then, and not till then, was the "philosophical nicety" introduced, that "slavery is not *sin per se*, is not *malum in se*, is not inherently sinful." What was the openly avowed object of this "philosophy?" To dissuade the people, especially Church members, from becoming abolitionists. To "stop the bewildering cry," (as Rev. Leonard Bacon then said), "of immediate and unconditional emancipation." In

word, the cion, the dist Mr. Beecher understand the which the be restored very "Sodo enthusiastic but are neu by clerical the Christia

At the late Society (Gan prominent l of Feb. 3, a

"Stephen view of the the Anti-Pla it entirely o John Brown tensive an in tency on the included, th Mr. Foster s of the United examination He was now instrument, entire concu of the ables sired to org and enforce

A writer i in the sam happily. A

Malum in oblique told, for it is conceded, b move it pro make it morate it unde

PAPILAGE. age to the sture, moral instructors o sent. Such things, suprengthen

But is Sl the person i struction? classes—the intelligent a prospect of instructed a freemen in distinction The planter the race." South Carol they should very. In t lation which should imp George Wo order of the and Pat and age of the drawn? M there be an man! The rality has clearly enunciati on. The If papilage inferiority and, in fact antagonisti very natura

word, the object was to introduce the confusion, the division, the distracted counsels, into the "anti-slavery host" that Mr. Beecher so truthfully describes. Let Mr. Beecher understand this. And let him know that there is no way in which the "enthusiasm and co-operation" so desirable can be restored but by treating slavery as inherently sinful, the very "Sodom and Gomorrah" of modern times. Cordial and enthusiastic co-operation against slavery are not produced, but are neutralized and laid asleep, by clerical doubts, and by clerical indifference and indecision as to the question, whether slavery is inherently sinful. It is against sin that the Christian is called to gird on his armor."

PROGRESS.

At the late Annual meeting of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society (Garrisonian), a speech of Mr. S. S. Foster, one of the prominent lecturers of that school, is reported in the *Liberator* of Feb. 3, as follows:

"Stephen S. Foster, of Worcester, gave, at some length, his view of the great service which John Brown had rendered to the Anti-slavery cause, as well as to the country. He thought it entirely owing to the strict logical and moral consistency of John Brown's life and example, that he made so deep and extensive an impression. It was owing to a want of this consistency on the part of the Abolitionists, as he thought, himself included, that they had accomplished no more than they have. Mr. Foster said he had recently been studying the Constitution of the United States;—he had never before given it a thorough examination—and his views of it had undergone a great change. He was now convinced that the Constitution was an Anti-Slavery instrument, and the views to which he had arrived had met the entire concurrence, in regard to their legal correctness, of some of the ablest lawyers in the city of Worcester. Hence he desired to organize an Anti-Slavery political party, to carry out and enforce this interpretation of the Constitution."

THE LIGHT ADVANCING.

A writer in the *N. Y. Times*, in reply to a defence of Slavery, in the same paper, by Geo. Wood, touches some points quite happily. As for example

Malum in se.—But, improve upon the institution, remove its objectionable features, legislate it into goodness, we are in effect told, for it is not *malum in se*. Gambling, it will probably be conceded, by the writer of that article, is not *malum in se*. Remove its prohibition from the statute book, and let legislation make it moral. Probably, polygamy is not *malum in se*; cultivate it under proper restrictions.

PEPILAGE.—"An inferior of the race must be in a state of pupilage to the superior." If I meant by this that those of higher culture, moral and mental, must, in society, necessarily become the instructors of those lesser, this proposition also challenges our assent. Such must inevitably be the case. In the nature of things, superior intelligence is instructive, and must elevate and strengthen inferior culture and power.

But is Slavery that state of pupilage? Is absolute control of the person for physical labor best calculated to impart that instruction? Is the whip the best master? Are the inferior classes—the pupils—better instructed by contact with the more intelligent as slave-masters, than as political equals, or with a prospect of reaching that equality? Are the ignorant better instructed and elevated in Slavery in South Carolina than as freemen in New York? If the principle is correct, ignoring all distinction of color, where in its application does it terminate? The planters of South Carolina belong to "a superior order of the race." There are a large, very large number of whites in South Carolina who belong to "an inferior order of the race"; they should be immediately taken into this "pupilage"—Slavery. In the city of New York, there is a large class of population which belongs to "an inferior order of the race." They should immediately be made slaves by the superior order.

George Wood and Charles O'Conor belong to a greatly superior order of the race to that of Pat Murphy and Hans Schmidt, and Pat and Hans should immediately be taken into the pupilage of the learned gentlemen! And where is the line to be drawn? Must every one superior enslave the inferior? Shall there be an absolute monarchy, the monarch to be the superior man! The truth is, the idea that superior intelligence or morality has any right of enslavement over the inferior, when clearly enunciated, is a monstrous proposition. Nor in its practical results does it any more recommend itself to our approbation. The very principle of Slavery is adverse to advancement. If pupilage, it is pupilage in a school organized to perpetuate inferiority; it is the removal of all incentive to improvement, and, in fact, of all facilities for improvement. It is essentially antagonistic to advancement. This is not only clear from its very nature, but is demonstrated by its practical effects where-

ever it has existed. It has not only proved to be a curse to the slave, but destructive to the advancement of a large proportion of the surrounding free. Where, to a few enabled to live thereby in idleness opportunity for mental and moral culture is furnished, to the many, who depend upon an industry rendered disgraceful by Slavery, it is the blight of the Bohemian Upas.

Who Signs the Petition?

Those who have been engaged in circulating the "Petition for a Personal Liberty Bill" along the stores of the principal streets of Williamsburgh, report some significant facts as to what classes of people, sign.

Not one signature has been obtained, so far as our experience extends, in liquor or cigar shops. Those big, fleshy, puffy-looking kind of men that hover about such places, and do nothing but eat, drink, smoke and sleep, always say "the niggers are better off as they are—lazy set!" and mutter something about "inferior race."

Few Irish names were obtained. Germans, when they understood the case, were usually very ready to affix their names.

Drygoods, grocers, hardware dealers, &c., about half and half.

The proprietors of apothecary shops were almost invariably interested in our favor.

These who kept us standing while they read over the whole, very deliberately, names and all, usually regarded us, at the close, with a hash of O'Conor's speech, slightly diluted, and didn't sign.

Women, as a class, were far more favorable than the other sex—and it is worthy of remark, too, that they always inquired into the right and wrong of the matter, while the latter canvassed it as a merely political question, viewing it in the light of "expediency."

Gentlemen who call us, girls, angels and ethereal creatures, generally, will please note the above fact

in the form of an instruction, but merely looked to the making of a certain inquiry.

Mr. Doolittle, of Wisconsin, [Rep.,] moved to amend the resolution by instructing the Committee to report a bill for the immediate admission of Kansas under the Wyandotte Constitution.

Mr. Pugh still said he would vote against all instructions, but he could vote for Mr. Brown's resolution merely of inquiry.

Powers of the Supreme Court.

Mr. Hale, of New Hampshire, in the course of remarks upon Mr. Brown's resolutions, referred to the veneration expressed lately by the Democratic party for the decision of the Supreme Court. This was a new idea with that party; for, from the time of Jefferson down to the period when they obtained control of the Court, it has been at open and undisguised hostility with its decisions—Jefferson had denounced it, Jackson disregarded it, and Mr. Buchanan assailed it on this floor. The Supreme Court once decided that the United States Bank was constitutional, and the Democratic National Convention immediately thereafter passed resolutions diametrically opposed to that decision. He then read the opinions of Jefferson, adverse to the deference now exacted for the decision of that Court, and also adverse to the views of Mr. Buchanan, in which he said the Court always leaned to the prerogatives of power. He proposed for himself to stand upon the principles of Jefferson. He read the decision of the Supreme Court of Georgia, in opposition to submitting to the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. He also read the decision of the Supreme Court of Pennsylvania in 1798, in which it was held that, in case of difference between a State and the United States, the people were the only umpire who could settle the question at issue; also the decision of the State of Virginia in 1812, in which the Supreme Court of that State expressed the opinion that the appellate power of the United States Court did not extend to that Court, and obedience to the mandate of the United States Court was refused.

The Slave Trade.

Mr. Morse, of Maine, [Rep.,] offered a resolution which lies over, calling on the President to communicate copies of all communications which have been received from the British Government and other officers, on the subject of the African Slave-trade, since January, 1858, and copies of all the correspondence between the British and the United States Governments on the subject of the Slave-trade.

NEW YORK STATE LEGISLATURE.

WOMEN'S RIGHTS.—An act for the protection of the property in trade and the earnings of married women has passed the House of Assembly, but has not been acted upon in the Senate.

NEGRO SUFFRAGE.—Hon. T. C. Callicott made a speech against the proposed change of the Constitution extending the suffrage to colored people on equal conditions with the whites. He repeats the slander against them, that they are "an inferior and abject race," and in evidence cites the decision of Judge Daggett, of Connecticut, in the case of Prudence Crandall, the decisions of several judges in the slave states, the practice of the State Department at Washington, and the Constitutions of Liberia and Hayti, excluding white people!

[**QUERY.**—Do the two latter precedents prove the "inferiority and abject" condition of the white people?]

The logic of Mr. Callicott proved unsuccessful. The resolution was adopted by a vote of 70 yeas to 36 nays.

Personal Liberty Bill.

Mr. Powell, from the Select Committee on the subject of a law to protect personal liberty and to prevent slave hunting in this State, made a written report to the Assembly on Saturday. We give below an abstract of its principal points.

The petitions referred to the Committee are numerously signed. Most of them read as follows:

The undersigned, citizens of the State of New York, respectfully ask you to put an end to slave hunting in New York, by enacting that no person, who has been held as a slave, shall be delivered up, by any officer or court, State or Federal, within this State, to any one claiming him on the ground that he owes "service or labor" to such claimant, by the laws of one of the Slave States of this Union.

Many of the petitions also contain the following appeal:

Shall the soil of the Empire State be longer polluted by the track of the Slavehunter?

Shall we ourselves be subject to his call to chase and catch his human prey?

Shall we be subjected to fines and imprisonments for refusing thus to degrade and dehumanize ourselves?

Mr. Bayard, of Delaware, [Dem.,] said the resolution was not

Must our doors and hearts be closed to the panting, starving stranger, who seeks shelter and protection from the remorseless kidnapper that would drag him back to the woes of the plantation from which he escaped?

Must we help to send him back to the land of chains and tortures, from which he fled through troops of blood-hounds scenting out his track; through forests where wild beasts prowl in the darkness; through rivers and dismal swamps; with no eye to pity him, save God's, shining through the North Star, guiding His despairing child to the nearest asylum, where the wicked cease from troubling?

Serious, solemn, momentous, are all these inquiries! What shall our answer be? First, we shall ask the Legislature to pass a law that shall forever protect our State from the desecrating presence of the slave-hunter. By the Fugitive Slave bill of 1850, we are now forbidden to shelter or assist the forlorn stranger who ever appealed for sympathy and aid. Fines and imprisonments impede over us for exercising one of the holiest charities of our religion. The law of God is defied. Vice, the foulest, the blackest, is exalted to virtue; while virtue, humanity, and holiness, are legislated into crime, and Heaven's own conditions of salvation are impiously reversed.

We rejoice to believe that our Legislature, by passing a Personal Liberty bill, can remedy these fearful wrongs.

The Committee recommend the enactment of a law in accordance with the prayer of the petitioners, for the following reasons, among others:

[These we omit, as they appeared, originally, in the *Principia*, No. 10, for January 21, being a part of the Appeal, adopted at a meeting held in the First Congregational Church in Williamsburgh, Brooklyn, E. D., January 11, and afterward issued on a separate sheet, being the 1st, 5th and 15th of the propositions therein laid down, and also the two closing paragraphs of the appeal.]

The Committee, give in an appendix, the substance of the different Personal Liberty laws in the Free States, as follows:

In 1850 Vermont led the way, immediately after the passage of the Fugitive Slave bill, by adopting a stringent Personal Liberty law, which has since been made still more effective.

In 1855 the Legislature of Massachusetts passed one yet more stringent, which was vetoed by Gov. Gardner on May 21, 1855, and immediately passed over his head by 32 to 3 in the Senate, and 230 to 76 in the House, and it is still the law.

Michigan has adopted a similar law.

Wisconsin adopted a yet more stringent law afterward, declaring all liens or executions upon judgments obtained under the Fugitive Slave law absolutely void; and this law has been enforced.

All these laws secure trial by jury to every fugitive slave.

Maine has forbidden all State officers from assisting in capturing or holding fugitives from labor, and has denied the use of her jails.

These laws will be found in Laws of Massachusetts, 1855, p. 924; Laws of Michigan, 1855, p. 413; Revised Statutes of Wisconsin, ch. 158, p. 912; Revised Statutes of Maine, 489, 491; Laws of Vermont, 1850.

In this State the Liberty bill received 84 votes last winter, against 22 in the Assembly, and failed in the Senate, the Committee thinks, only from want of time—not of votes.

The action of this State in favor of Freedom is traced down from John Jay's administration through those of Tompkins and Seward to the present time. The record is honorable to the State, and the Committee believe it only wants the enactment of an effective Personal Liberty law to make New York in fact, as in name, a Free State. No worthier monument they say could be erected to the honor of Jay, Tompkins, Seward and other champions of Liberty than such a statute.—*N. Y. Tribune*.

[The friends of freedom will soon see whether there will be a falling off, since the vote of last year. If there should be, it will be owing to the timidity of Republican politicians in anticipation of the pending Presidential election. In that case, they will forfeit the confidence and support of all who love freedom more than the spoils of office.—Editor.]

FROM KANSAS—ABOLITION OF SLAVERY.—The following Bill has passed the House, by a vote of 30 yeas to 6 nays.

An Act to Prohibit Slavery in Kansas:

Be it enacted by the Governor and Legislative Assembly of Kansas Territory:

SEC. 1. That Slavery or involuntary servitude, except for the punishment of crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, is, and shall be, forever prohibited in this Territory.

SEC. 2. That this act shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage.

A Correspondent of the *N. Y. Times* says:

It was like drawing teeth to bring the Democrats up to vote. They tried every evasion, but at last were compelled to face the music, when only six dared to vote against the Bill.

Movement of Negroes to Hayti.

CHARLESTON, Friday, Feb. 10, 1860.

A special New-Orleans dispatch to *The Courier*, says that fifty wealthy free agriculturists from the interior of Louisiana are preparing to depart for Hayti.

Affairs at Richmond.

Special Message of Gov. Letcher—Virginia Declines to participate in the Southern Conference.

RICHMOND, Va., Monday, Feb. 13.

Gov. Letcher sent in a message to the Legislature to-day, giving a history of the requisition for Coppic, and denouncing the duplicity of Gov. Kirkwood, of Iowa, in aiding his escape. He urges prompt action on the part of the South, to put itself in a position where it can secure the punishment of those who offend against its laws.

The Joint Committee on the South Carolina Mission reported the following resolutions to the Legislature to-day:

Resolved, That the General Assembly of Virginia, recognizing in our present relations with non-slaveholding States an imperative necessity for decisive measures, does not yet mistrust the capacity of the Southern States, by a wise and firm exercise of their reserved powers, to protect the rights and liberties of the people, and to preserve the Federal Union. For this purpose, we earnestly desire the concerted action of the Southern States, but the General Assembly respectfully submits to the consideration of South Carolina and all sister States of the South, that efficient co-operation will be more safely obtained by such direct legislative action of the several States as may be necessary and proper, than through the agency of an assemblage which can exercise no legislative powers except to debate and advise.

Resolved, Therefore, that in the opinion of the General Assembly, it is inexpedient to appoint deputies to the Conference proposed by South Carolina.

Resolved, That the Governor of this Commonwealth be requested to communicate the foregoing resolutions to the Governor of the State of South Carolina, and to the Governor of each of the Slaveholding States.

The Irrepressible Conflict Again—Attempt to Lynch a Pennsylvanian.

From the Pittsburgh Evening Chronicle.

Great excitement was occasioned in the western part of Washington County, a few days ago, by the attempt on the part of a number of citizens of Marshall County, Va., to hang a young man named Albert Patterson, of West Finley township, Washington County, for giving too free an expression of his sentiments on John Brown and Governor Wise. It appears that Patterson had been invited to a wood-chopping in the village of West Union, in Marshall County, Va., just over the Pennsylvania line. In the course of the evening, among other topics of conversation, the Harper's Ferry raid was introduced, Mr. Patterson remarking, in that connection, that he considered "Old Brown a fool, and Gov. Wise no better." At this the young Virginians present became greatly enraged, declaring vengeance against him for his treasonable declaration, and calling out, "Let's hang him," &c. Accordingly three of them seized hold of him, and throwing a rope around his neck, were, to all appearances, about to put their threats into execution; but, fortunately for Mr. Patterson, just at the moment, a couple of young men from the Pennsylvania side of the line were passing on their way to singing school, in the immediate vicinity, and hearing the struggle, rushed into the house and relieved him. Had this timely assistance not been afforded, there is no telling what might have been the result, as Mr. P., when released from his assailants, had already been choked until he was black in the face. When the occurrence was mentioned at the singing-school, which was only at the other end of the village, it gave rise to a considerable excitement, and a number of West Finley boys—neighbors of Mr. Patterson, who is a peaceable and inoffensive young

man—being present, it was with some difficulty they were prevented from taking summary vengeance upon the perpetrators of this dastardly outrage. Fortunately, however, prudent counsels prevailed, and, in all probability, a sanguinary conflict was, in this way, prevented.

Conclusion of Hazlett's Trial—Verdict of Guilty.

BALTIMORE, Feb. 19, 1860.

The trial of Hazlett has been concluded. On Friday evening, his counsel, Mr. Green, made an able defence; then the case was submitted to the jury, when the Court adjourned. On Saturday, when the jury rendered a verdict of murder in the first degree, the prisoner received the announcement with the same indifference that has characterized his conduct throughout the trial.

Southern writers assail Mr. Douglas' new Sedition Law and improved Federal Slave Code as follows:

"We say that any law empowering the Federal authority to interfere in such a case by military force, will be utterly unconstitutional, and it will be as dangerous as it will be unconstitutional. It will authorize the Federal Government to pry into all assemblies of the people in a State—to set up a system of espionage, totally inconsistent with the free exercise of their rights—and upon suspicion or rumor use the military of the United States against the people. Of course we suppose every Consolidationist in Washington to vote for such a measure. It marks the progress of the Federal Government to a consolidated despotism."

THE VIRGINIA REBELLION—ATTEMPTED ARREST OF COPPIK—HIS ESCAPE.—A few days ago, an officer from Virginia arrived at Des Moines, Iowa, with a requisition from the Governor of Virginia on the Governor of Iowa, for the body of young Coppic, brother of the one who was executed at Charlestown, for participation in the Harper's Ferry disturbance. Young Coppic, after the arrest of his brother and John Brown, managed to escape to Canada, but recently returned to his home at Spring Grove, Iowa.

Gov. Kirkwood, on examining the Virginia officer's papers stated that they were informal, and refused his warrant. The officer then sought the aid of the United States Marshal, but, in the meantime, a friend of Coppic started on horseback to inform him of his danger; and it is presumed he escaped before the United States Marshal could reach his house.—*Richmond Whig*.

ONE OF SENATOR HUNTER'S SLAVES RUN OFF.—A correspondent of the Baltimore Sun writes from Berryville, Clarke County, Va., as follows:

"A report reached here the other day, from the most reliable source, that a slave (a man) belonging to R. M. T. Hunter, Senator from Virginia, was kidnapped and conveyed in the underground railroad to Canada. Strange as it may seem, the kidnapper was a Northern lady, a member of a distinguished family there. The name of the lady and the whole story will be made public in a few days. An old college mate of Mr. Hunter, a resident of this place, wrote him, yesterday, the full particulars of the extraordinary affair."—*Anglo-African*.

The Washington correspondent of a leading South Carolina journal thus deplores the growing weakness of the Slave States:

"Day by day, year by year, and census by census, the South is becoming hopelessly weak and powerless, beside the mammoth North—made so by the channels of commerce and immigration which have been marked out, and protected by Federal legislation. The subject is inexhaustible in fact and argument."

It would appear that South Carolina has given up the expectation of her Disunion Convention, which she hoped would come of Mr. Memminger's mission to Virginia. The Orangeburg Southron thus soliloquizes:

"When Virginia, after the raid of John Brown, refuses to meet us in friendly debate, we confess that our hopes of a Southern Confederacy are almost destroyed."

Wm. S. Bailey, publisher of the "Free South," at Newport, Ky., has commenced suit against a number of citizens of that place, for the destruction of his newspaper press and apparatus, laying his damages at \$15,000.

Miss Reb-

to death

fire,

and be-

agon-

y.

The steam-

touching at C-

She reports t-

on the 31st u-

of the casual-

lost, but the

House of Com-

Russell in refe-

Minister state-

the French G-

a few days to

had announ-

inst. In reg-

can hardly f-

Britain relinq-

United States

an intermedia-

the remaining

announcemen-

Journal repre-

Moniteur, in at-

of the doctrin-

the necessary

civil governm-

publication of

are hastening

with Sardinia.

garian questi-

Protestants of

Another victo-

rocco. The ri-

the Moorish p-

2,000, and to t-

Nena Sahib ap-

India.

The London

"An addre-

New York, de-

signed by the

Candidh, Ale-

Sir B. Wellwo

The semi-off

that Savoy is

soon again for

the Alps.

A naval lette

of November,

"The Ameri-

steamer Powha-

in the United

Mr. Ward has

United States

will, no doubt,

only commer-

appears to be t

in Formosa.

The French

from Touron, r-

inst., between

lasted three q-

Nemesis, two o-

many were won-

great. The Fr-

The question

British Parlia-

ment and propos

the precise obj

rate we may b-

This eminent

and brilliant la-

poor and the ig-

tracted and sp-

shall come for-

ming the at en-

has given so m-

anyone.

The followin

the Federal C

care, and has

His testimony

to the confide

W.

BRO. GOODE

pleted a preac

through Willi

known here,

PROVIDENCE, Thursday, Feb. 2.

Miss Rebecca Blodget, a very estimable lady, was burned to death this morning. Her clothing accidentally caught fire, and before relief could be rendered, she died in extreme agony.

FROM EUROPE.

The steamship Bohemian, from Liverpool on the 1st inst., touching at Queenstown on the 2d, reached Portland yesterday. She reports the loss of the ship Endymion, of this port, by fire, on the 31st ult. The vessel was lying in the Mersey at the time of the casualty, preparing to sail for New York. No lives were lost, but the vessel and cargo were entirely destroyed. In the House of Commons, inquiries had been addressed to Lord John Russell in reference to the annexation of Savoy to France. The Minister stated in reply that representations had been made to the French Government on the point; and it might be proper in a few days to lay the papers before Parliament. Mr. Gladstone had announced his design to introduce the budget on the 6th inst. In regard to the San Juan difficulty, the London *Times* states that the negotiations are proceeding upon a basis which can hardly fail to be accepted by the United States. Great Britain relinquishes her claim to an extreme easterly, and the United States to an extremely western channel; and fix upon an intermediate line, which leaves San Juan to England, and the remaining islands to this Government. The most important announcement from France is the suppression of the *Univers*, the journal representing the interest of the Pope at Paris. The *Moniteur*, in announcing the fact, gives as a reason, the tendency of the doctrines advocated by the suppressed paper, to dissolve the necessary alliance between religion and the institutions of civil government; the immediate reason, however, being the publication of the Pope's recent encyclical letter. Preparations are hastening in Italy for the consolidation of the Central States with Sardinia. A less favorable aspect is presented by the Hungarian question, the delegation sent to the Emperor, by the Protestants of that kingdom, having been refused an audience. Another victory had been obtained by the Spanish arms in Morocco. The right wing of the army had attacked and gained the Moorish positions in its front, with a loss to the enemy of 2,000, and to the victors, of 200. The rumor of the death of Nena Sahib appears to be confirmed by the latest advices from India.

The London *Star* of the 21st of January says:

"An address of sympathy with the Rev. Dr. Cheever, of New York, dated at Edinburgh, January 19, 1860, has been signed by the Right Honorable the Lord Provost, Rev. Drs. Candlish, Alexander, Glover, Thompson, Guthrie and Begg; Sir B. Wellwood Moncrieff, Bart.; General Anderson, &c."

The semi-official *Patricie*, of Paris, of the 22d inst., informs us that Savoy is essentially a French province, and that it will soon again form part of France, whose frontiers will thus reach the Alps.

A naval letter from China, dated at Hong Kong on the 30th of November, published in the London *Times*, says:

"The American flag officer Tatnall, in the United States steamer Powhatan, has been succeeded by flag officer Stribling, in the United States steamer Hartford.

Mr. Ward has arrived here from Shanghai. The treaty with the United States has been ratified. Before you receive this, you will, no doubt, have read the various articles composing it. The only commercial advantage of any importance obtained by it appears to be the opening of the two ports, Swatow and Taiwan, in Formosa.

The French steamer Pregent, which arrived two days since from Toulon, reports that an engagement took place on the 18th inst., between the French forces and the Cochin Chinese, which lasted three quarters of an hour. Capt. d'Abouville, of the Nemesis, two other officers and five men were killed. A great many were wounded. The loss on the Cochin Chinese was very great. The French succeeded in taking two strong forts."

The question of Slavery is to receive a fresh discussion in the British Parliament. Lord Brougham has introduced the subject and proposes to treat it fully. We do not learn what are the precise objects which Lord Brougham aims at, but at any rate we may be sure of an exhaustive exposition of the topic. This eminent statesman and wonderful man commenced his long and brilliant labors as an enemy to Slavery, and friend of the poor and the ignorant, and it will be a fitting close of his protracted and splendid career, if, at the advanced age of 81, he shall come forth in his yet undiminished power to aid in stemming the attempted reaction on the great question to which he has given so many of the best years of his life.—*Tribune*.

The following is from a lawyer, who has himself studied the Federal Constitution in its bearing on slavery, with great care, and has written with marked ability on the subject. His testimony to the lectures of Bro. McCormick is entitled to the confidence of the friends of freedom.

For the Principia.

WORDS OF ENCOURAGEMENT.

BRO. GOODELL.—Rev. T. B. McCormick has just completed a preaching and lecturing tour, of about three weeks, through Williams and adjoining counties. He was well known here, by reputation, before his recent visit; but it

required a sight of the man, and the hearing of his voice, to give anything like an adequate idea of his powers as a preacher and lecturer. It has never before been our good fortune, "out West," to hear a man of his ability speak upon the subject of slavery. You know that he is a Radical man—one who knows no law for slavery; and he seldom fails to convince his auditors of the correctness of his positions. As a preacher of the true Gospel of Christ, he has but few equals; and as a lecturer, he has no superiors. He was well received throughout his entire recent tour through this region—and how could it be otherwise? He is a very able man, and convinces all the convincible ones who hear him, that he has the best good of the entire human family at heart. He knows no distinctions in the rights of men, because of white, black, yellow, or red skins; nor does he find any authority in law, or in the Constitution of the U. S., for saying that "black men have no rights which white men are bound to respect;" but accords to all men everywhere, their natural, God-given rights.

Mr. McCormick is devoting his whole time and talents to this work—preaching on the Sabbath and lecturing through the week; and, judging from what he has done in this region, is doing much good. His lectures are of a high moral tone—far above the mere politician. He does not grapple with parties, merely, but presents the truth, leaving the people to form their own party connections.

I am satisfied that he is doing much to liberate the slave from his chains. His arguments, in the slave's behalf, are irresistible, and, as a consequence, many are compelled by his reasonings to come out on the side of Radical Abolitionists. He should be encouraged by the friends of the slave wherever he goes; as he is a gentleman every way worthy of their most implicit confidence.

W. A. HUNTER.

Bryan, O., Feb. 10, 1860.

Family Miscellany.

From the Analyst.

EMMA'S WISH.

Plant flowers on my grave, mother,
Plant flowers on my grave—
My sleep will not be sad, mother,
Where lovely flowers wave.

I loved the flowers so well, father,
In my pleasant home with you,
They will scatter fragrant tears, father,
Over me in pearly dew.

When life was failing fast, father,
They called me fading "flower,"
I left my earthly house, father,
To bloom in lovlier bower.

Plant flowers on my grave, mother,
They'll fade full soon, I know;
They emblem me so well, mother,
My little life below.

Their leaves will fade like me, mother,
But the flowers will bloom again:
So my life has been renewed, mother,
On thin joyous spirit-plain.

Then father, mother, plant sweet flowers,
And brothers, sisters, come
And see them fade; but when they bloom
Think of my spirit-home.

Dear father, cease to feel regret—
Be happy, mother dear;
It is enough that perfumed flowers,
Bright mornings, drop a tear.

My home, so free from every pain,
So bright—so pure—so free;
And when you come, I'll welcome you
With heavenly minstrels.

Olmsted Falls, O.

SARAH E. UNDERHILL

\$100 REWARD.

Ran away from the subscriber at Fairfax Court House, Virginia, Tuesday, December, 27th, 1859, a mulatto man calling himself Lewis Lee, 28 or 30 years of age, about 5 feet high, spare, but well built, active, quick in motion and speech, and very polite in his manner. Very light mulatto, straight sandy hair, and light grey eyes. I will give the above reward for his apprehension and return, or if lodged in jail, so that I get him again.

N. B. WATKINS.

January 8, 1860.

REPLY.

LEWIS LEE TO N. B. WATKINS.

Ye have stolen all else from the African man,
But the color God gave him to wear,
The South now stealing that as fast as it can,
Infusing light color and hair.

If your grandfathers stole mine on the African coast,
And stole him to make him his slave,
The right that gives you, sir, to me, is at most,
But the right of the robber and knave.

Or, if my father was your grandfather's son,
And your father enslaved his half brother,
Am I made your slave by the violence done
To the chastity of my grandmother,

Can one-fourth of my blood a slave make of me?
One, your courts bind you not to respect,
Still, three-fourths of my blood declares I am free,
And your claims to my service reject.

For as oft as one pound of my flesh you can claim,
My right to three pounds is far better,
Just as good as your right to your body or name,
A God giv'n right, to the letter.

Now Shylock, if you your one pound can get
Without a drop of my blood, nor give pain,
Your slave code would allow you to take it, and yet,
My own right to myself I maintain.

You have advertised me, let me advertise you,
That "Jehovah no attribute hath,"
"Can side with oppressors," His justice is due,
And man-stealers inherit his wrath.

Lewis Lee

Underground R. R., January 22, 1860.

For the Principia.

TREES.

What a wild, solitary, dreamy companionship there is in trees! And, is it true, that their communings partake of the nature of our own reflections, or do they not rather awaken in kindred minds the same peculiar chord of inspiration and feeling?

When the leaves rustle, hope springs lightly in the heart and dances gaily in the breath of the breeze: and as we sit watching the waving light as it gleanas to and fro, through the thick foliage, upon the green sward at our feet, the mind unconsciously wanders over the checkered scenes of the past; the sweetest reminiscences are stirred, and deepest shades are interspersed with light. Over all, the sun shines bright, but his beams are softened and subdued. And now, mellowed by the distance, even grief imparts a mournful enjoyment, and we can muse calmly over moments of the deepest agony.

Have none of my readers ever wandered alone in a pine forest, and listened to its melancholy moaning, like the solemn hash of the ocean on an unknown shore? Or its gentle rush and roar as of a distant city, whose hurrying and bustle, whose jars, whose clashing and clangor, are all blended in one pleasing, soothing, lulling monotone. The breakers of life dash afar off, as it were, faintly, and yet there is a presence, which moves in the branches, and startles us with the intensity of its nearness. Relieved only by the sweet cooing of the turtle dove, it has a charm which penetrates to the innermost recesses of our being, and pervades the whole atmosphere around, like the soft, low breathing, as of a thousand viewless spirits. Oh! what high and holy aspirations are stirred within! What vague, indefinite longings reach forward into the future! How we seek to tear the veil which hides our destiny! What an outgoing is there after the unknown and illimitable—and we long to float away on the essence around us, to the uttermost bound of the universe!

But the Oak tree produces by its strength, its grandeur, and magnificence, more forcible conceptions of power and reality.

We gaze up into its giant branches with awe; we essay breathlessly, to imagine its growth of centuries. Here, in the wild woods it has battled with the elements; has shrieked in every gale, and tossed its huge arms in defiance. Each renewing Spring has clothed it in verdure—and succeeding Autumn in gold and crimson splendor. The hoar frosts have arrayed it gorgeously, and bathed its feet in a flood of glory; yet left it chill and bare to the bleak winds of Winter.

There is something almost overpowering and painful to me, in its massive strength and grandeur: or rather as it impresses in our contemplative mood, as a symbol of human power and reason. As vigorous sentinels of those stalwart forces with which each has to grapple in the contest of life, they appear in the forest, to surround us, like an iron girdle, and to circumscribe the sphere of the imprisoned spirit which presses heavily against them. But the far off

long-leaved pine, with its single tuft of verdure, tall, slender, and erect, points to Heaven at last, and wafts on the buoyant spirit to its final victory.

It is a dear old saying, and ever fresh to the throbings of Nature, that trees with which we are familiar, become to us like old friends. With what affection do I remember a wide-spreading Ash, beneath whose noble branches, a large concourse might assemble; whose shade afforded a favorite retreat after our daily rambles. Its history too, was closely connected with those dear to me.

I love to recall a Tulip Poplar, of a species unknown in this vicinity, whose symmetry was to me a "thing of beauty, and a joy forever." E'en now, my yearning heart would leap over all the confines of time and space, to gaze once more, on its perfect and cone-like proportions; and until the glory of terrestrial objects, ceases to be but a faint emblem of the spiritual, and until we are satisfied in the likeness of Him who is the Author, and the perfection of all that is lovely, so long shall that beautiful tree put forth its leaves, ever fresh and green in my memory.

The Louisville, Ky., Journal satirizes, as below, the idea of a voluntary non-intercourse of the South with the North. In publishing its article, below, we do not mean to command the matrimonial alliances that transform Northern young ladies into "mistress of seraglios," as a sister of James Madison characterized Southern matrons. We like the moral of Whittier's "Yanke girl" until slavery is abolished. A procession of young ladies, in Rochester, N. Y., we think it was, paraded through the streets under a banner, on which was inscribed, "Total abstinence, or no husbands." So we would virtually inscribe over the mantel piece of every Northern parlor—"Emancipation, or no Southern husbands"—or, perhaps, with more exactness, "No slaveholding husbands—nor wives."

Protest Against Non-Intercourse.

Our good friend of the Richmond *Whig* cordially approves the idea of "the formation of voluntary associations throughout Virginia and the South, bound together by a common pledge among themselves neither to eat, drink, wear, buy or use any article whatsoever manufactured at or imported from the North." All this may be very well, to touch the pockets of the North, but how are we to protect the southern heart against the fascinating belles of Boston, New York and Philadelphia.

The girls who give the South
What gold could never buy?

There is no need of forming any other "voluntary associations" than those imposed by the marriage service. True our fathers in the revolution, made and carried out a similar pledge in regard to importations from the mother country, but they never made the importation of the mothers of the country contraband. We propose a war of retaliation. If the North will interfere with our Southern domestic institutions, let our young men go forth and rob the Northern homes of their most cherished ornaments and bring them back to form more patriarchal relations among us. And let us conquer prejudices by the potent aid of love, and bring willing captives to our arms.

The idea of not eating New England salmon next Spring or of refusing the ice crop from Chicago when the dog-star rages; the bare thought of having Indiana Grouse, or a Maine supply of potatoes interdicted to us; of being compelled to read of New York oysters, or Pittsburgh ale, and be in the tantalizing condition of not enjoying them; the terrible calamity involved in giving up the Newark cider, sold for champagne, or the rectified whiskey of Cincinnati, drugged for Old Otard Brandy; the shivering sensation produced by the very thought of refusing to be supplied with Pennsylvania coal this winter, by Kellogg & Co., because it is mined by an under-ground railroad; the setting our obdurate appetites against the produce of Hoosier pigeon roosts, a teal of blue wing because they fly from the North; all these are overwhelming. We are patriotic enough, as the world wags, but we cannot surrender our gastronomic liberty. Caesar had his Brutus. Charles I. his Cromwell, and a voluntary association to neither eat or drink Northern good things has its Louisville *Journal*; if that is treason, make the most of it. Our friend of the Richmond *Whig* will forgive us, if, after having stood politically, shoulder to shoulder for years, we now put stomach to stomach on this question of "internal improvements."

It is hard to sunder old ties, and our very bowels will yearn to be re-united, but then stomach bitters give an appetite and promote digestion, and so we drain the bitter cup to the dregs.

THE FATE OF GREAT MEN.

In a world where the fortunes of the great and the good have been pain, poverty, exile, persecution, crucifixion, burning alive, shall we think it strange that efforts to do good are often ill received, and that the heavenly kingdom is slow in its coming! For the poet's lines embody an awful truth:

"Truth forever on the scaffold;
Wrong forever on the throne."

Homer was a blind singer; Socrates was made to drink the hemlock; Matildes died in prison; Aristides was banished; Themistocles died in exile; Cicero and Julius Caesar were killed; Brutus fell on his sword; and Seneca was compelled to open his own veins in the bath. And of the Bible men, Abel was killed; Joseph sold into captivity, Josiah shot by archers; Jeremiah cast into a miry dungeon; Daniel thrown into the lion's den; and "others had trials of cruel mockings and scourgings," of whom the world was not worthy. Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, was crucified; Stephen was stoned; John the Baptist beheaded; James killed by the sword; and Paul and Peter died on the cross. The goodly fellowship of the prophets, and the glorious company of the apostles, all formed a part of the noble army of martyrs.

Justin was put to death; Chrysostom exiled; Arius persecuted; and Origen maligned and tortured; Servetus was burned alive with green boughs; John Huss, Jerome of Prague, Latimer, Ridley, Cranmer and Rogers, died at the stake. William Wallace was quartered; Galileo tortured; Savanorola martyred; Joan of Arc burned alive; and Raleigh, Russell and Sydney beheaded; Milton was blind and Savage starved to death; Toussaint L'Overture died in a dungeon, and Napoleon, who put him in prison, died as an exile on the barren rock of St. Helena.* Zwingle was killed in battle, Barneveldt was beheaded, and Dr. Priestly mobbed and driven into exile. Kossuth, Mazzini, and Victor Hugo are to-day in banishment.

In a world like this, what dost thou expect, O, my soul? Dost thou covet ease, safety, and glory? No; if thou art true to thy highest and noblest convictions, thou wilt not be alarmed if thou meet with rebuffs, pain, persecutions, and even death. But thou wilt remember that there is another life, after this life, and the Holy One has said, "Blessed are they who are persecuted for righteousness sake, for theirs is the kingdom of heaven."

* We do not intend to indorse the characters of all these, as "great and good."—EDITOR.

The Importance of Sleep.

About one third of the life of man is spent in sleep. He who lives to reach the age of three-score years and ten, will have spent more than twenty-three years of this period, in unconscious repose. This simple fact alone is sufficient to proclaim the overwhelming importance of sound, refreshing sleep to the health, happiness and longevity of man.

The origin of much of the nervousness and impaired health of the individuals who are not decidedly sick, is owing to a want of sufficient and quiet sleep. To procure this, should be the study of every one. It is to be feared that the great praise of early rising has had this bad effect—to make some believe that sleep was of but little consequence.

We have heretofore stated that in our opinion the most frequent and immediate cause of insanity, and one of the most important to guard against, is the want of sleep. Indeed, so rarely do we see a recent case of insanity that is not preceded by want of sleep, that it is regarded as almost sure precursor of mental derangement.

Notwithstanding strong hereditary predisposition, ill-health, loss of kindred and property, insanity rarely results unless the exciting causes are such as to produce a loss of sleep. A mother loses her only child, the merchant his fortune—the politician, the scholar, the enthusiast, may have their minds powerfully excited and disturbed; yet if they sleep well, they will not become insane. No advice is so good, therefore, to those who are in delicate health, as that of securing, by all means, sound, regular, and refreshing sleep. It is true that some few persons are able to perform much mental labor, and to study late at night, and yet

sleep well. Some require but little sleep. But such individuals are very rare. Gen. Pichegru informed Sir Gilbert Blane that during a whole year's campaign he did not sleep more than one hour in twenty-four. Sleep seemed to be at the command of Napoleon, as he could sleep and awake, apparently at will.

M. Guizot, Minister of France under Louis Philippe, is a good sleeper. A late writer observes that his faculty for going to sleep after excitement and mental exertion is prodigious, and it is fortunate for him that he is so constituted, otherwise his health would materially suffer. A Minister in France ought not to be a nervous man; it is fatal to him if he is. After the most boisterous and tumultuous sittings at the Chambers, after being baited by the opposition in the most savage manner—there is no milder expression for their excessive violence—he arrived home, threw himself upon a couch, and sunk immediately into a profound sleep, from which he was undisturbed till midnight, when proofs of the Moniteur were brought to him for inspection.—Editor.

To this we will add, that though early rising is to be commended, it is the early retiring that comes of early retiring to rest. If deprived of sleep in its proper season, it should be supplied the first opportunity afterward. But no morning or noon-day sleeping will make amends for the loss of sleep in the early part of the night.—EDITOR.

MEN who concentrate themselves all upon one point may be sharp, acute, pungent—they may have spear-like form of character, but they are never broad, and round, never full of proportionate manhood which can only be obtained by carrying forward the whole of a man in an even breasted march.—*An Exchange*.

Well, now, the truth of that saying depends entirely, or what that "one point" may be, that the man concentrates himself upon. If it be some selfish, partial, sinister point, the saying is as true as, that a part is smaller than the whole. But let a man concentrate himself upon the one point of the golden rule, equal and impartial love to all, and he will be broad and even breasted enough. Much of the complaints heard about "men of one idea" having "one point" comes from men with but half an idea, or none at all, and is leveled against men of the broadest benevolence, because they will not narrow themselves down to one sect, party, race, or complexion.

There is great truth in that old saying, "That duties are esteemed not by their acts, but by their ends." As the shining sun puts out the fire, so the glory of God must consume all other ends. Two things make a good christian—good actions and good aims. And though a good aim doth not make a bad action good, as with Uzzah, yet a bad aim makes a good action bad, as in Jehu's case, whose justice was approved, but his policy punished. God writes "Nothing" on all those services, wherein men's ends are not right.

Many preachers in our days are like Heraclitus, who was called the dark doctor. They affect sublime notions, obscure expressions, and uncouth phrases, making plain truth difficult, and easy truths hard. "They darken counsel with words without knowledge." Studied expressions, high notions in a sermon, are like Ashael's carcass in the way, that did only stop men, and make them gaze, but did no way profit or edify them. It is better to present truth in her native plainness than to hang her ears with counterfeit pearls.

When the house is on fire, if a man should only pray or cry, he may be burnt for all that; therefore he must be active and stirring; he must run from place to place and call out for help and bestir himself as for life, in the use of all means whereby the fire may be quenched. So grace must be acted on; it is not all a man's praying and crying that will profit him or better him; grace must be exercised, or all will be lost—prayers lost, tears lost, strength lost, soul lost.

WRITINGS OF WILLIAM GOODELL.

For sale at the office of the *Principia*:

DEMOCRACY OF CHRISTIANITY, 2 Vols.,.....	\$1 50
SLAVERY AND ANTI-SLAVERY (History of) 1 Vol.,.....	\$1 00
AMERICAN SLAVE CODE, 1 Vol.,.....	\$0 75

* TERMS CASH.

D. D. NICHOLSON, PRINTER, 109 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK.

VOL. I
Published
Harper's
Books
Direct bu
as above

Our object,
Christian refor
kindred crimin
ties, business
the Church, th
God, restoring
type of heaven
our expedio
see our pa
Editor

It is to
some men
the position
hold that
purposes, a
as *malum* t
that there
to shield a
Slaveholding
that there
holders, an
it will cond
them sinne
willingnes
inherently
system of S
pronounce
point at wh
character—

We kno
would app
to be held
system of e
malum in
stick about
the inheren
in the ditch
'legal relat
and at leng
it—are stick
the Chinese
hundreds, i
mud, not a
struggle is a
and sophisti
to protect th
chin. You
attempt to c
you are sho
A writer i
very thorou
to *malum in*

"Since the
upon the pu
editors of s
Slaveholding
parent inqui
banding ab
in his Comm